

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1-47 were originally submitted.

Claims 10, 13, and 18 are canceled without prejudice.

Claims 48, 49 and 50 were previously added.

Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14-17, and 19-50 remain in this application.

1 **35 U.S.C. §112**

2 Claims 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as  
3 being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject  
4 matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 13 and 18 are canceled  
5 without prejudice.

6  
7 **35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

8 Claims 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 41,43, 45  
9 and 50, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahead  
10 Software's Nero program (Nero) in view of U.S. Patent 5,113,517 to Beard et al  
11 (Beard), in further view of U.S. Patent 5,866,699 to Belfiore et al (Belfiore).  
12 Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20,  
13 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 41,43, 45 and 50.

14 Belfiore teaches transferring data to common destinations using a common  
15 destination list is provided. A user uses a software facility to transfer source  
16 objects using a list of common transfer destinations. By selecting a source object  
17 and issuing a transfer command, the user causes the facility to display in  
18 conjunction with the source object a list of common transfer destinations  
19 ("common destination list"). When the user selects a destination from the common  
20 destination list, the facility initiates a transfer of the source object to the selected  
21 destination. Belfiore, Abstract.

22 **Independent claim 12**, for example, "[a] method comprising:

23 managing a plurality of computer resources by an operating system;  
24  
25

1                   dynamically accepting designations from a computer user of the  
2                   plurality of computer resources to be written to a removable storage  
3                   medium; and

4                   presenting, in response to a user clicking on an icon representative of  
5                   the removable storage medium, a menu where the user is able to select a  
6                   staging area not currently visible to the user.

7                   The Action admits that “Nero and Beard do not teach a graphical user  
8                   interface which in response to the user clicking on an icon, presents a menu where  
9                   the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user.” The  
10                  Action relies on Belfiore as teaching this element, citing Fig. 2C, element 220 of  
11                  Belfiore.

12                 Belfiore teaches that a source object 200 is a bitmap object, containing a  
13                 picture of a honeycomb cell. The user uses a mouse to select the source object  
14                 200. In response to the user’s selection of the source object 200, the facility  
15                 displays in conjunction with the source object 200 a context menu 210. The  
16                 context menu 210 is comprised of a list of commands that the user may apply to  
17                 the source object. The user applies a command from the context menu 210 by  
18                 selecting the command with a mouse. Fig. 2C teaches that the selection of the  
19                 “send to”, or transfer, command 211 from the context menu 210. In response, the  
20                 facility displays the common destination list 220. The common destination list 220  
21                 contains a list of frequently used destinations. These include container  
22                 destinations, such as “3 1/2 Floppy (A)”, “5 1/4 Floppy (B)”, and “Shortcut To Send  
23                 To” Folder. The common destination list 220 also includes non-container,  
24                 executable destinations such as “Dialer”, “Microsoft Word”, and “Shortcut to HP  
25                 Laser Jet”. At this point, the user may select any of the destinations displayed in

1 the common destinations list in order to transfer the source object 200 to that  
2 destination. Belfiore, col. 3 line 48 to col. 4 line 4.

3 There is no teaching or suggestion in Belfiore that the “destinations” in the  
4 common destination list 220 are “staging area(s)”, as recited by claim 12. Belfiore  
5 teaches that the common destination list is provided to the user so that the user can  
6 directly write or transfer a source object to destination. In other words, there is no  
7 teaching or suggestion that the “destination” taught by Belfiore is a staging area.

8 For example, that Application describes that in response to browsing to a  
9 staged-write resource area, the browser defines two visual sub-areas within content  
10 area. These visual sub-areas are referred to herein as stored resource display area  
11 and staging area or staged resource display area. The stored resource display area  
12 contains icons representing files or other resources that have already been written  
13 to the current staged-write resource area (in this case, “D:\My Media”). The  
14 staging area, on the other hand, contains icons representing resources that the user  
15 has designated for writing to the writable storage medium, but that have not yet  
16 been written. Application, page 10 lines 9-16.

17 Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of  
18 claim 12 be withdrawn.

19 **Dependent claims 15 and 16** are allowable based at the least on their  
20 dependency on claim 12. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of  
21 claims 15 and 16 be withdrawn.

22 **Independent claim 17** recites “in response to the user clicking on an icon,  
23 presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently  
24 visible to the user”.

1 The Action presents the same arguments in rejecting claim 17, as those used  
2 in rejecting claim 12, as to Belfiore. Applicant presents the arguments in support  
3 of claim 12, in support of claim 17. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103  
4 rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

5 **Dependent claims 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 25** are allowable based at the least  
6 on their dependency on claim 17. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103  
7 rejection of claims 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 25 be withdrawn.

8 **Independent claim 27** recites “in response to the user clicking on an icon,  
9 presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently  
10 visible to the user”.

11 The Action presents the same arguments in rejecting claim 27, as those used  
12 in rejecting claim 12, as to Belfiore. Applicant presents the arguments in support  
13 of claim 12, in support of claim 27. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103  
14 rejection of claim 27 be withdrawn.

15 **Dependent claims 29, 30, 31 and 33** are allowable based at the least on  
16 their dependency on claim 17. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103  
17 rejection of claims 29, 30, 31 and 33 be withdrawn.

18 **Independent claim 41** recites “in response to the user clicking on an icon,  
19 presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently  
20 visible to the user”.

21 The Action presents the same arguments in rejecting claim 41, as those used  
22 in rejecting claim 12, as to Belfiore. Applicant presents the arguments in support  
23 of claim 12, in support of claim 41. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103  
24 rejection of claim 41 be withdrawn.  
25

1           **Dependent claims 43, 45 and 50** are allowable based at the least on their  
2 dependency on claim 41. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of  
3 claims 43, 45 and 50 be withdrawn.

4  
5           Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as  
6 being unpatentable over Nero in view of Belfiore. Applicant respectfully traverses  
7 the rejection of the claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

8           **Independent claim 1** recites “in response to the user clicking on an icon,  
9 presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently  
10 visible to the user”.

11           The Action presents the same arguments in rejecting claim 1, as those used  
12 in rejecting claim 12, as to Belfiore. Applicant presents the arguments in support  
13 of claim 12, in support of claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103  
14 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

15           **Dependent claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8** are allowable based at the least on  
16 their dependency on claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection  
17 of claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 be withdrawn.

18  
19           Claims 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, and 49, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as  
20 being unpatentable over Nero in view of U.S. Patent 5,946,277 to Kuroda et al  
21 (Kuroda), in further view of Belfiore. Applicant respectfully traverses the  
22 rejection of the claims 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, and 49.

23           **Independent claim 35** recites “in response to the user clicking on an icon,  
24 presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently  
25 visible to the user”.

1           The Action presents the same arguments in rejecting claim 35, as those used  
2 in rejecting claim 12, as to Belfiore. Applicant presents the arguments in support  
3 of claim 12, in support of claim 35. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103  
4 rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn.

5           **Dependent claims 36, 37, 38, 40, and 49** are allowable based at the least on  
6 their dependency on claim 35. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103  
7 rejection of claims 36, 37, 38, 40, and 49 be withdrawn.

8  
9           Claims 28, 42, and 48, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being  
10 unpatentable over Nero in view of Beard, in view of Belfiore, in further view of  
11 Kuroda. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims 28, 42, and 48.

12           **Dependent claim 28** depends upon base claim 27, and therefore includes  
13 the element “in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where  
14 the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user” as recited  
15 by claim 27. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element.  
16 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 28 is allowable. Applicant  
17 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 28 be withdrawn.

18           **Dependent claim 42** depends upon base claim 41, and therefore includes  
19 the element “in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where  
20 the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user” as recited  
21 by claim 41. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element.  
22 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 42 is allowable. Applicant  
23 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 42 be withdrawn.

24           **Dependent claim 48** depends upon base claim 1, and therefore includes the  
25 element “in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the

1 user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user” as recited by  
2 claim 41. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element.  
3 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 48 is allowable. Applicant  
4 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 48 be withdrawn.  
5

6 Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over  
7 Nero and Belfiore, in view of U.S. Patent 6,499,095 to Sexton et al (Sexton).  
8 Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claim 9.

9 **Dependent claim 9** depends upon base claim 1, and therefore includes the  
10 element “in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the  
11 user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user” as recited by  
12 claim 9. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element.  
13 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 9 is allowable. Applicant  
14 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.  
15

16 Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over  
17 Nero and Belfiore, in view of U.S. Patent 6,640,269 to Stewart et al (Stewart).  
18 Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claim 11.

19 **Dependent claim 11** depends upon base claim 1, and therefore includes the  
20 element “in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where the  
21 user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user” as recited by  
22 claim 11. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element.  
23 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 11 is allowable. Applicant  
24 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.  
25



1 Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over  
2 Nero, in view of Kuroda, in view of Belfiore, and in further view of Stewart.  
3 Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claim 39.

4 **Dependent claim 39** depends upon base claim 35, and therefore includes  
5 the element “in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where  
6 the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user” as recited  
7 by claim 35. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element.  
8 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 35 is allowable. Applicant  
9 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn.

10  
11 Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over  
12 Nero, in view of Beard, in view of Belfiore, in view of U.S. Patent 6,678,764 to  
13 Paravulescu et al (Paravulescu). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of  
14 the claim 14.

15 **Dependent claim 14** depends upon base claim 12, and therefore includes  
16 the element “presenting, in response to a user clicking on an icon representative of  
17 the removable storage medium, a menu where the user is able to select a staging  
18 area not currently visible to the user” as recited by claim 12. As discussed above,  
19 Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these  
20 reasons, claim 14 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103  
21 rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

22  
23 Claims 24 and 32, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being  
24 unpatentable over Nero in view of Beard, in view of Belfiore, in further view of  
25 Sexton. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims 24 and 32.

1       **Dependent claim 24** depends upon base claim 17, and therefore includes  
2 the element “presenting, in response to a user clicking on an icon representative of  
3 the removable storage medium, a menu where the user is able to select a staging  
4 area not currently visible to the user” as recited by claim 17. As discussed above,  
5 Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these  
6 reasons, claim 24 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103  
7 rejection of claim 24 be withdrawn.

8       **Dependent claim 32** depends upon base claim 27, and therefore includes  
9 the element “in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where  
10 the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user” as recited  
11 by claim 27. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element.  
12 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 32 is allowable. Applicant  
13 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 32 be withdrawn.

14  
15       Claims 26, 34, and 44, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being  
16 unpatentable over Nero in view of Beard, in view of Belfiore, in further view of  
17 Stewart. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims 26, 34, and  
18 44.

19       **Dependent claim 26** depends upon base claim 17, and therefore includes  
20 the element “presenting, in response to a user clicking on an icon representative of  
21 the removable storage medium, a menu where the user is able to select a staging  
22 area not currently visible to the user” as recited by claim 17. As discussed above,  
23 Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element. Accordingly, for at least these  
24 reasons, claim 26 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103  
25 rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

1       **Dependent claim 34** depends upon base claim 27, and therefore includes  
2 the element “in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where  
3 the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user” as recited  
4 by claim 27. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element.  
5 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 34 is allowable. Applicant  
6 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 34 be withdrawn.

7       **Dependent claim 44** depends upon base claim 41, and therefore includes  
8 the element “in response to the user clicking on an icon, presenting a menu where  
9 the user is able to select a staging area not currently visible to the user” as recited  
10 by claim 41. As discussed above, Belfiore fails to teach or suggest this element.  
11 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 44 is allowable. Applicant  
12 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 44 be withdrawn.

13  
14       Claims 46 and 47, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being  
15 unpatentable over Nero in view Sexton, in further view of Stewart, in further view  
16 of Kuroda, and in further view of Belfiore. Applicant respectfully traverses the  
17 rejection of the claims 46 and 47.

18       **Independent claim 46** recites “in response to the user clicking on an icon,  
19 presenting a menu where the user is able to select a staging area not currently  
20 visible to the user”.

21       The Action presents the same arguments in rejecting claim 46, as those used  
22 in rejecting claim 12, as to Belfiore. Applicant presents the arguments in support  
23 of claim 12, in support of claim 46. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103  
24 rejection of claim 46 be withdrawn.

1           **Dependent claim 47** is allowable based at the least on their dependency on  
2 claim 46. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 47 be  
3 withdrawn.  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**CONCLUSION**

All pending claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14-17, and 19-50 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: January 18, 2008

By: /Emmanuel A. Rivera/  
Emmanuel A. Rivera  
Reg. No. 45,760  
(509) 324-9256 ext. 245